

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated June 21, 2010 ("*Office Action*"). In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 are pending and rejected. Applicants have amended Claims 10 and 12 and cancelled Claims 4, 8, 9 and 11. Applicants submit that no new matter is added by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### **Claim Objections**

The *Office Action* rejects Claims 4 and 8 due to informalities. Without conceding to the objection and solely for purposes of advancing this case to allowance, Claims 4 and 8 have been cancelled rendering the objection to these claims moot.

#### **Section 112 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects Claims 4 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Claims 4 and 8 recite claim elements that are ambiguous and indefinite. Without conceding to the rejection and solely for purposes of advancing this case to allowance, Claims 4, 8, 9, and 11 have been cancelled rendering the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph moot. Claims 10 and 12 have been amended to depend from Claims 5 and 1, respectively. Such amendments also render the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph moot.

#### **Section 102 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039738 issued to Cutlip ("*Cutlip*"). Additionally, the Office Action rejects Claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0002955 issued to Gadbois et al. ("*Gadbois*"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration for the reasons discussed below.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal

Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added); M.P.E.P. ch. 2131. “The **identical invention** must be shown in as **complete detail as contained** in the . . . claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added); see also M.P.E.P. ch. 2131. In addition, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); In re Bond, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. ch. 2131.

The Federal Circuit recently clarified this standard in *Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.*, 2008 WL 4614511 (Fed. Cir. 2008). In *Net Moneyin*, the Federal Circuit held that a finding of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is proper only when a “reference discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also **all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way** as recited in the claim.” *Net Moneyin* at \*10 (emphasis added). The prior art reference must “**clearly and unequivocally** disclose the claimed invention . . . **without any need for picking, choosing, and combining various disclosures not directly related to each other by** the teachings of the cited reference.” *Id.* (emphasis added, internal typographical notations omitted).

Independent Claim 1 of the present Application, as amended, recites:

A method for use in a Web Services system having complex UDDI object(s), the method comprising:  
providing a database for storing at least one directory parent object within a first object class, the at least one directory parent object storing a plurality of attributes, wherein the at least one directory parent object stores at least one unique attribute that occurs only once in the at least one directory parent object and a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object;  
using a processor in communication with the database to create a first directory child object for storing a first value associated with the repeating attribute, the first directory child object also within the first object class;  
using the processor to remove the repeating attribute from the at least one directory parent object such that the at least one directory parent object comprises only unique attributes; and  
storing, in the database, the value associated with the repeating attribute in the first directory child object.

Neither *Cutlip* nor *Gadbois* disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claims.

1. **Neither reference discloses a parent object that stores “a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object”**

For example, it continues to be Applicants’ position that neither *Cutlip* nor *Gadbois* disclose, teach, or suggest a directory parent object that stores “a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object,” as recited in Claim 1.

In the *Office Action*, the Examiner continues to rely on Figures 3 and 15A-B of *Cutlip* as disclosing the recited claim elements. (*Office Action*, pages 4 and 10-11). Specifically, the Examiner states that “*Cutlip* teaches a directory parent object business entity 320, which has 1 to many discovery URLs, one to many contacts and zero to many business services. (*Office Action*, pages 10-11). As previously shown by Applicants, however, Figure 3 “is a Unified Modeling Language (“UML”) diagram” providing “a precise description of the relationship between various entities.” (*Cutlip*, Page 3, paragraph 42). It seems that the Examiner is equating the BusinessEntity 320 with Applicants’ “parent object” and each of the URLs, contacts, business services as attributes in the parent object. Applicants respectfully disagree.

If “Business Entity 320” is a parent object (a fact that is not explicit from *Cutlip*), then discoveryURL 300, contact 310, BusinessService 330, Binding Template 340, and tModel 350 are child objects associated with BusinessEntity 320. (*Cutlip*, Figure 3). There is no disclosure that, at any point, the information stored in the child objects was once stored in the parent object. Accordingly, even to the extent that the child objects store repeating elements (a fact that Applicants do not admit), there is no disclosure that the BusinessEntity 320 object, as the parent object, stores “a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object,” as recited in Claim 1.

In the *Office Action*, the Examiner states that “the child objects having one to many relationships may represent repeating attributes . . . because of the fact that they repeat or have a one to many relationship.” (*Office Action*, page 11). Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants claim does not recite that the parent object has a child object that stores repeating attributes. Rather, Applicants’ claim specifically recites that “the at least one directory **parent object stor[es]** a plurality of attribute, wherein the at least one directory **parent object stores** . . . a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent

object.” It continues to be Applicants’ position that the relationship between the objects, as disclosed in *Cutlip*, does not speak to the attributes that are stored in the Business Entity object, which the Examiner has identified as the parent object. (*Office Action*, pages 3 and 9).

Rather, *Cutlip* specifically discloses that there is at least one (and may be many) Discovery URL objects being associated with the Business Entity object 320. (*Office Action*, Figure 3; Page 4, paragraph 42). Similarly, there are at least one (and may be many) Contacts objects being associated with a Business Entity 320 object. (*Office Action*, Figure 3; Page 4, paragraph 42). In contrast there may be zero to many Business Service objects being associated with Business Entity 320. (*Office Action*, Figure 3; Page 4, paragraph 42). However, the attributes of the child objects that are associated with the Business Entity object in the hierarchical structure of *Cutlip* (i.e., Discovery URL, Contact, Business Service, Binding Template, and Tmodel) are not attributes stored in the Business Entity object. Accordingly, *Cutlip* does not disclose, teach or suggest a directory parent object that stores both “at least one unique attribute that occurs only once in the at least one directory parent object and a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object,” as recited in Claim 1.

For similar reasons, Applicants also continue to submit that the claim elements are absent from the disclosure of *Gadbois*. As previously shown by Applicants, *Gadbois* merely discloses a hierarchical structure in which each organization is represented by a node and includes sub-nodes for further information. In the *Office Action*, the Examiner points to business service nodes 242 as being analogous to Applicants’ parent object and business service1 243 and business service2 242 as being analogous to Applicants’ child objects. (*Office Action*, page 9). Even to the extent that one considers the identified nodes of *Gadbois* as being analogous to Applicants’ objects, there is not disclosure in *Gadbois* that the business service node 242, as the parent node, stores both “at least one unique attribute that occurs only once in the at least one directory parent object and a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object,” as recited in Claim 1.

In fact, *Gadbois* merely discloses that “an Organization1 is represented at node 22, and Organization2 is represented at node 224.” (*Gadbois*, page 3, paragraph 27). “Each organization node is typically coupled to a number of interior sub-nodes which contain further information, or links to further information, regarding the respective organization.” (*Gadbois*, page 3, paragraph 28). Thus, the businessService 1 node and the businessService 2

node provide additional information about the various and different business services offered by Organization 1. There is no other disclosure of the contents of these nodes.

Furthermore, Applicants' claim does not recite that the parent object has a child object that stores repeating attributes. Rather, Applicants' claim specifically recites that "the at least one directory *parent object stor[es]* a plurality of attributes, wherein the at least one directory *parent object stores* at least one unique attribute that occurs only once in the at least one directory parent object and a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object." It continues to be Applicants' position that the relationship between the objects does not speak to the attributes that are stored in the Business Entity object, which the Examiner has identified as the parent object. (*Office Action*, pages 3 and 9). It continues to be Applicants' position that the attributes of the objects that are beneath the Business Services object in the hierarchical structure of *Gadbois* (i.e., BusinessService1 and BusinessService2) are attributes stored in the BusinessServices object, which the Examiner has identified as the parent object. Accordingly, *Gadbois* does not disclose, teach or suggest a directory parent object that stores both "at least one unique attribute that occurs only once in the at least one directory parent object and a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object," as recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1, together with Claims 2-3 that depend on Claim 1. For analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 5, together with Claims 6-7 that depend on Claim 5.

**2. Neither reference discloses "using the processor to remove the repeating attribute from the at least one directory parent object such that the at least one directory parent object comprises only unique attributes"**

As another example, it continues to be Applicants' position that neither *Cutlip* nor *Gadbois* disclose, teach, or suggest "using the processor to remove the repeating attribute from the at least one directory parent object such that the at least one directory parent object comprises only unique attributes," as recited in Claim 1. In the *Office action*, the Examiner states that "[b]oth *Cutlip* and *Gadbois* teach directory parent objects having repeating attributes and creating a directory child object associated with the repeating attributes." (*Office Action*, page 10). The Examiner further states that "Both *Cutlip* and *Gadbois* teach

that repeating attributes are moved into child objects and thus the directory parent object is left with only unique attributes.” (*Office Action*, page 12). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Rather, and as previously shown by Applicants, *Cutlip* merely discloses a hierarchical structure that includes at least one (and may be many) Discovery URL objects, Contact objects, BusinessService objects, BindingTemplate objects, and tModel objects being placed below a Business Entity object 320. (*Office Action*, Figure 3; Page 4, paragraph 42). Likewise, *Gadbois* discloses a hierarchical structure in which each organization is represented by a node and includes sub-nodes for further information. Specifically, business service1 243 and business service2 242 are sub-nodes that are placed below a business service node 242. (*Gadbois*, page 3, paragraph 28). Even to the extent that *Cutlip* and/or *Gadbois* disclose that repeating attributes are stored in the child objects (a fact that Applicants’ do not admit), there is no disclosure in either reference that the data stored in the child objects was removed from the parent object and placed in the child objects.

In the *Office Action*, the Examiner acknowledges that “the references do not explicitly recite the language “removing the repeating attributes” but states that “it is clear that repeating attributes are represented as child objects and are, thus, removed from the directory parent object.” (*Office Action*, page 12). Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants’ claims recite a method consisting a specific combination of elements and operations. For example, Applicants claim begins with providing a database storing “at least one directory parent object storing . . . a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object.” An operation is performed on the parent object that includes “remove[ing] the repeating attribute from the at least one directory parent object such that the at least one directory parent object comprises only unique attributes.” Even if the cited references disclose storing repeating elements in child objects, the claims do not disclose the step of “remove[ing] the repeating attribute from the at least one directory parent object such that the at least one directory parent object comprises only unique attributes.” Such a piecemeal rejection of Applicant’s claim fails to give credence to each element of Appellant’s Claim 1 and to the overall combination of features recited in the claim. The M.P.E.P. provides that “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (citing *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970)). Applicant respectfully submits that a rejection of Claim 1 under the *Cutlip* or *Gadbois*, which requires modification of adaptation of the disclosure of

the references is inappropriate under 35 U.S.C. § 102, which requires that a “reference disclose[] within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also *all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way* as recited in the claim.” *Net Moneyin* at \*10 (emphasis added). Additionally, the rejection of Claim 1 under the *Cutlip* or *Gadbois*, in the manner proposed by the Examiner, fails to consider each and every word in the claim.

For at least these additional reasons, neither *Cutlip* nor *Gadbois* disclose, teach or suggest “using the processor to remove the repeating attribute from the at least one directory parent object such that the at least one directory parent object comprises only unique attributes,” as recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1, together with Claims 2-3 that depend on Claim 1. For analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 5, together with Claims 6-7 that depend on Claim 5.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects Claims 4 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable *Gadbois* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,499 issued to Colgan (“*Colgan*”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,054,858 issued to Sutherland (“*Sutherland*”). Independent Claims 4 and 8 and dependent Claims 9 and 11. Dependent Claims 10 and 12 has been amended to depend from Claims 5 and 1, respectively, and are not obvious over the proposed *Gadbois-Colgan-Sutherland* combination at least because Claims 10 and 12 include the limitations of their respective independent claims, which Applicants have shown above to be allowable. Since Claims 9 and 11 incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims, Applicants have not provided detailed arguments with respect to Claims 9 and 11. However, Applicants remain ready to do so if it becomes appropriate. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 9 and 11.

**CONCLUSION**


Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants believe no fee is due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

  
Jenni R. Moen  
Reg. No. 52,038  
(214) 415-4820

Date: August 2, 2010

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**